

Serial No. 09/225,245
November 3, 2004
Page 2

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 remain in this application. Claims 10 and 11 stand allowed, and claims 3-9 and 14-20 stand objected to as depending from a rejected base claim but otherwise are indicated to be directed to allowable subject matter. Claims 1, 2, 12 and 13 as amended in the preliminary amendment filed April 26, 2004 continue to be rejected as being unpatentable over the "admitted prior art" in view of Yoshimi et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,603,093. This ground of rejection again is respectfully traversed as not being well-founded, and further reconsideration of this application is requested.

In particular, claims 1 and 12 recite a device and method of performing detection of interference waves **that is carried out by a base station** of a wireless communication system. Yoshimi neither discloses nor suggests such a device or method.

The invention as claimed provides significant advantages over the method proposed by Yoshimi. In particular, when an interference wave occurs in the same frequency band as the downlink channel signal that is transmitted from the base station to the mobile communication terminal, it becomes necessary to change the frequency band of the downlink signal. According to the teaching of Yoshimi, as previously explained, interference waves are detected on the mobile communication terminal side. Therefore, when such an interference wave is detected, an additional operation of transmitting from the mobile communication terminal to the base station a request for changing the frequency band of the downlink signal is required according to Yoshimi. Further, when the proposed new frequency band requested by the mobile communication terminal is already being used by other mobile communication terminals within the region covered by the base station, it is necessary to transmit yet another request from the mobile communication terminal to the base station.

In contrast, according to the invention as set forth in claims 1 and 12, the interference waves are detected **in the base station itself**. Accordingly, the base station actively changes the frequency band of the downlink signal to the mobile communication terminal, and because the base station already has knowledge of the frequency bands of downlink signals being used by other mobile communication terminals in the region, the frequency band change has to be performed only once upon detection of an interference wave.

Serial No. 09/225,245

November 3, 2004

Page 3

As previously explained, Yoshimi does not suggest that the prior art method of using a dedicated measurement device to measure interference waves in a zone covered by a base station, while the base station is stopped from transmitting radio waves, is a possible, albeit unpreferred, embodiment of the Yoshimi invention. To the contrary, Yoshimi states that the prior art method sometimes leaves a region of an undesired state of reception in the zone (col. 2, ll. 18-20), and further that mobile radio communication service is impaired during the measurement (col. 2, ll. 21-25). As such, Yoshimi clearly does teach away from using the conventional prior art method of interference wave detection using a dedicated measurement device, as discussed in columns 1 and 2 of that reference. The Board decision on rehearing stated that Yoshimi does not teach away from the proposed combination of the prior art method with the acknowledged prior art of Fig. 11 of the present application, because "[a]ll of the disclosures in a reference 'must be evaluated for what they fairly teach one of ordinary skill in the art.' In re Boe, 355 F.2d 961, 965, 148 USPQ 507, 510 (CCPA 1966). Yoshimi's discussion of the prior art is part of the disclosure. The fact that the prior art method may have problems does not constitute a teaching away." Decision on Request for Rehearing at 3, emphasis added.

The Board did not rely on any legal precedent to support its conclusion that a discussion in a reference of problems with the prior art and a proposal by the reference of a solution that overcomes those problems, does not constitute a teaching away. To the contrary, it is submitted that such a situation represents a paradigm example of a "teaching away" as established by the controlling case law.

In view of the teaching of Yoshimi that the prior art method sometimes leaves a region of an undesired state of reception in the zone (col. 2, ll. 18-20), and further that mobile radio communication service is impaired during the measurement (col. 2, ll. 21-25), and that Yoshimi teaches that detection of interference waves should be performed instead by a mobile communication terminal, a person of ordinary skill in the art would not have attempted to use such prior art method to modify the system of Fig. 11 of the application, but would be led by Yoshimi in a direction divergent from the path that was taken by the applicant. See In re Gurley, 27 F.3d 551, 553, 31 USPQ2d 1130, 1131 (Fed. Cir. 1994).

Serial No. 09/225,245

November 3, 2004

Page 4

While the Board acknowledged Yoshimi's discussion of the disadvantages of use of the prior art method (Decision at 5), the Board adopted an improper standard that the reference must show that the prior art method "does not work" in order for the reference to be found to teach away from the claimed invention. To the contrary, the case law requires only that a person of ordinary skill in the art be discouraged from making the proposed combination that is the claimed invention. In re Gurley, supra.

In the outstanding Office action, the Examiner alleges that it would have been obvious "to adapt the teaching of Yoshimi for stopping the transmitting means to the base station of AAPA to provide more properly detecting interference signal." Applicants disagree with this conclusion because it has no basis in fact anywhere in the prior art. That is, Yoshimi discloses in the background section thereof a prior art stand-alone dedicated measurement device, and according to the invention thereof teaches the detection of interference waves on the mobile communication terminal side. There exists absolutely no teaching, suggestion, or motivation anywhere in Yoshimi or the AAPA to make the modification proposed in the Office action. Instead, the only suggestion for making such a modification comes from the present application.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, further and favorable reconsideration of this application, withdrawal of the outstanding grounds of rejection, and the issuance of a Notice of Allowance are earnestly solicited.

Please charge any fee or credit any overpayment pursuant to 37 CFR 1.16 or 1.17 to Deposit Account No. 02-2135.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED,			
NAME AND REG. NUMBER	Vincent M. DeLuca Attorney for Applicants Registration No. 32,408		
SIGNATURE	Vincent M De Luca	DATE	3 NOV 04

Serial No. 09/225,245
November 3, 2004
Page 5

<i>Address</i>	Rothwell, Figg, Ernst & Manbeck 1425 K Street, N.W., Suite 800				
<i>City</i>	Washington	<i>State</i>	D.C.	<i>Zip Code</i>	20005
<i>Country</i>	U.S.A.	<i>Telephone</i>	202-783-6040	<i>Fax</i>	202-783-6031